1928.

Department of Land Rev. &

OFFICE of the Board of Rev

STATION Madras

(Mis) **No.** 3289

Dated 4-10-28

	Date	Initial
Given for copying		
Copied		
Examined		
Signed		
Given for despatch		
Despatched		
Indexed		
To be destroyed on*		

(SUBJECT.)

Survey - Resurvey South Kanara

Mangalore Udipi and Coondapur taluks - Considered unnecessary G.O. - communicated

BOARD OF REVENUE + LAND REVENUE & SETTLEMENT
29 SEP. 1925

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue Department.

Memorandum:- No.3184 E-25-1, dated 28th September 1925.

Survey - Resurvey - Mangalore taluk - Paragraph 3 of the
Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No.1562
dated the 20th July 1925. (N)

pp 33-36 (1-R 1562/2075) (N)

Adverting to its reference No.G.3574/24-4, dated 9th June 1925 the Government consider that the field maps of the villages of the Mangalore taluk may be quite accurate enough and enable sub-divisions to be made and stones to be replanted notwithstanding that the survey was not on the traverse basis and that the villages were measured in 160 acre blocks and were divided into long triangles. If these considerations were sufficient it would simply mean that all areas surveyed on the block map ~~of~~ or 'G' line system should be redone The thickly planting of the country will affect the replacement of stones under any system of survey, as there is no system that will enable this to be done without measuring offsets. The Board of Revenue is accordingly requested to report on the quality of the survey work in the Mangalore taluk and the possibility of using it as a basis for future work irrespective of the fact that the survey is not on the traverse basis.

p.42 of (N)

As regards paragraph 3 of the Board's Proceedings No.1562 Mis., dated 20th July 1925 the Board of Revenue is informed that the Government understood that as the result of the conference and in view of the orders issued in Memorandum No.1504 E/25-3, dated 10th July 1925 the Board would be reporting further on the point xxx and that was the reason why no orders were passed on the Board's Reference No.G.3574/24-4, dated 9th June 1925 relating to the resurvey of the Mangalore taluk.

(M)

p 33-36 of (N)

E. W. Legh,
Second Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue and Settlement.

Forwarded.
(By Order)

N.J.28-9-1925.

Resurvey – Mangalore taluk

G 3676/25

Ref No. G 3676/25 d 5-10-25

I R 11-11-25

The Dir of Survey is requested through the Collector of South Canara to submit the report called for in para 1 of the Govt memorandum

2-10-25 2/10

5/10 25

To The Dir of Survey
Copy to the Collr / South Kanara

. 32

In reply, please quote number, date and short title.*

SETTLEMENT DEPARTMENT.

Received Registered

S. KANARA COLLR'S OFFICE
No.
13 NOV 1925

From (Name) F.P. Vincent Gompertz Esq.,
(Designation Director of Survey,
Post Box 404, (Station) Triplicane
Telegraphic Address Survey - Madras.

To The Secretary to the Commissioners of,
Land Revenue and Settlement,
Chepauk, Madras.

THROUGH THE COLLECTOR OF SOUTH KANARA.,

D.Dis No.642/R/E/25 dated 10th Novr. 1925.

Enclosures

Spare Copies

Sir,

Survey - Mangalore Taluk - Quality of work - Report submitted.

Please see Board's Ref: No.G.3676/25-1 dated the 5th October 1925.

2. The field maps of the Mangalore Taluk were traced from the block maps and most of them contain perimeter measurements only.

They are not accurate enough to enable stones to be replanted without the assistance of the offset measurements in the block maps. The measurements in these were written in pale blue ink, so that they should not appear when the block maps were reduced by photography to form the village maps, and many of them had become undecipherable when it was considered necessary some ten years after the survey to provide Shanbogues with a complete record of measurement - the ferro prints.

Many measurements have therefore been omitted in the ferro prints and many of the measurements entered are incorrect.

3. Thickly planting of the country would not affect replacement of stones in areas surveyed on the diagonal and offset method and on a traverse basis, as each field plan provides short offsets for the replacement of any stone or point in the field, and checks on the -

correctness of the perimeter measurements. The offsets in block map surveys branch from lines sometimes more than 40 chains long, the initial and closing points often cannot be identified and it is generally beyond the competence of the Shanbogues to lay out the lines even when the points can be identified.

The unreliability of the present records of measurement makes the task far more difficult.

Nor are the field maps sufficient to enable subdivisions to be made.

The Collector of South Kanara reported - para 5 Board's Ref: No.G.3574-24-4 dated 9-6-25 that "the measurement and plotting of a new subdivision, more often than not necessitated the resurvey of the whole field and of the fields adjoining it."

This has been my experience elsewhere. Had the survey been on a traverse basis, there would have been some fixed points to start from and close on to.

I am dealing here with Mangalore Taluk only and it is possible that the survey in other taluks will not be so defective. It was found during the experimental survey that 80% of the holdings in Bodanthila and 77% of those in Thiruvayal (Mangalore taluq) required resurvey because areas were incorrect, boundaries had altered, or survey had been made incorrectly

L.Dis.No.3611-25.

BOARD OF REVENUE
20 NOV. 1925
LAND REVENUE SETTLEMENT

Submitted to the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue and Settlement, Madras.

2. I have already expressed my views regarding the quality of Survey work in the Mangalore Taluk while stating the difficulties experienced in the Revenue Administration of this Taluk in my report D.Dis.No.3538-25 dated 24th May 1925 to the Board.

pp 28-29 of Ⓝ

South Kanara Collector's office,
Camp Puttur, 17th November 1925.

For Collector.

18/11/25

M.D'S.18/11.

R 4937

REVENUE & SETTLEMENT
1 - DEC. 1925

Revenue Department.

Branch.

REMINDER.

To

The Board of Revenue
LR & Settt

The undersigned ~~has the honour to invite~~ is directed to invite attention to the communication noted in

No. 3186 E/25 dated 28.9.25 request that this reminder may be returned at once with information as to—

(1) the stage at which the matter now is,

(2) the date by which a reply may be expected~~; and~~

~~3) the circumstances which have caused the delay.~~

2. It is requested that the reply to this reminder may be sent not later than 10.12.25

Office Revenue Settt
Station Fort St George
Dated 30.11.1925

Signature.
Designation

Subject.—

FOR MEMBER

Survey—Resurvey (S. Kanara) Mangalore Tk—further investigation.

150

N.S.O.

5 | 11-50

No. 5 dated [illegible] /12 8 192

" " " ——— , " ——— 192

READ ALSO :—

egister No. ———, From the ———, No. ———, dated ——— 192

G 2616/25

" " ——— " ~~" 2 " " , 192~~ Refce No. G 3676/25-1 dt 5-10- 192

G 4815/25 from the D of S {A. to the Collr of S. Kanara} 192

No. G 3676/25-2 No. ———, dated 5-12 192

The report of the Dir of Survey and the Endt ~~[illegible]~~ by the Collr of S. Kanara are subd Govt with refce to their Memorandum No. 3184 E-95-1 dt 20-4-25. The views already expressed by the Collr of S. Kanara on the quality of the survey work in the Mangalore Taluk have been embodied in the Bd's Refce to Govt No. G 3076/25-1 dt 9-6-25 subd by the Dir of Survey also presupposes the conclusion previously arrived at that a resurvey of the Mangalore Taluk is necessary.

Wy
30-11-25

[illegible]
1-12-25

a/1-12-25

3-12-25

To the Second Secy to Govt.

Board of Revenue
DEC. 1925
Land Revenue and Settlement

Revenue Department
9520

Resurvey of Mangalore - Reference from the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue and Settlement) No. G.~~H~~.3676/25-2 dated 5th December 1925. [illegible]

Board of Revenue
17 DEC. 1925
Land Revenue

Memorandum No.3184 E/25-2, dated 16th December 1925.

The Government are not prepared to accept the present report as sufficient having regard to Mr. Couchman's opinion dated 3rd March 1924 communicated to the Board of Revenue in Revenue u.o. No.608 E/24-3, dated 11th April 1924. The Board of Revenue is requested to state whether the Director of Survey and the Collector of South Kanara can supply concrete instances in support of the general conclusions to which they have arrived, and whether the present Commissioner of Settlement is prepared to express an opinion of the subject based on his personal knowledge and verification of the records on the ground.

A. D. Crombie
Under Secretary.

To the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue and Settlemen

Forwarded.

(By Order)

Superintendent.
16/12/25

To the Superintendent Rev Dett. E Sectn

Survey —Mangalore Rly. Govt. memorandum No. 5184 E/25-2 d 16-12-25

Pl. say whether Mr. Couchman's opinion d 3rd March 1924 referred to in the Govt memo is different from his opinion d 7-12-22 copy of which was subd to Govt with B.O. Ref no E 0112/22-3 d 17-1-23 disposed of in G.O. Mis No 195 Revd 2- 1923. If so pl send a copy of the long opinion d -3-24 which is not traceable here

C.[illegible]271—763 Bks —7-1-22.

OFFICE OF THE__________

Dated__________

__Hours__________

TELEPHONIC MESSAGE.

From The Supdt. Rev. Deptt. E Secn.

To The Senior Supdt. G. Sec

Refce. your T. M. regarding Surva Manglore Taluk.

Please see Bds' G.O. no 245, 24-3 D/ 2-6-21 It is in reply to a G.O note which substantially reproduces Mr Couchmans opinion D/ 3-3-1924. A copy will be sent as soon as the file which is now in circulation is available

FOR MEMBEL

As/8a

Mangalore 21

Issue ev
ag
22/12

READ AGAIN B.P No. ________ dated ________ 192

________ , " ________ ________ 192

READ ALSO :—

Register No ________ , From the ________ , No. ________ , dated ________ 192

P.G.C.F G. 5200/25-a

" ________ " " " ________ , " ________ , " ________ 192

" " ________ , " " ________ , " ________ , " ________ 192

11.30 Am
23/12

RESOLUTION.

G. 3182/25-3
No. ________ , dated 22-12- 1925

The Board requests to be furnished with a copy of Mr. Couchman opinion, 3rd March 1924 referred to in the Govt memorandum.

2-12-25

of 11-4-24 substantially reproduced Mr. Couchman's opinion d/ 3-3-24. The inference is that a copy of the opinion was not sent to Bd with Govt U.O. no 608 d/ 11-4-24 as stated in the Govt memo. As the opinion is specifically referred to, it seems necessary to apply for a copy officially.

22/12/25

22/12

BOARD OF REVENUE LAND REVENUE & SETTLEMENT
9-JAN. 1926

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue Department.

Memorandum No.3184 E/25-3, dated 5th January 1926.

Re-survey - South Kanara - Mangalore taluk - Board's Reference No.G.3184/25-3, dated 22-12-1925.

A copy of Mr. Couchman's opinion dated 3rd March 1924 is forwarded to the Board of Revenue.

A. D. Crombie
Under Secretary.

To the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue and Settlement.

Forwarded.

(By Order)

B. S. Krishnan
Superintendent.

Opinion of Mr. M.E.Couchman, dated 3rd March 1924.

I have always admitted that the survey of the Kasaragode Taluk was bad from a survey point of view. I am not therefore surprised at ~~a~~ ~~ax~~ the figure given by the Director of Survey. Still, we should look at the question mainly from

(1) the financial point of view

(2) the political point of view

Taking (1) first, the discrepancies are not such ~~of~~ would make any appreciable difference to the Revenue. What is in excess in one field will be in deficiency in the adjacent field. Mr. Priestley's experience of gardens round house-sites which have not been brought to account is interesting. In paragraph 33 of my Settlement Introduction Report I drew attention to the [illegible] fact that the Revenue Department would have to bring these to account. This has been apparently neglected in the villages referred to by Mr.Priestley. It is, however, not a reason for a Re-survey. The work could easily be done by the shortbogus if they were gingered up. I feel sure that the increased revenue which Government would get from a resurvey would be a mere fraction of the cost of a resurvey.

In Kasaragod Ta [illegible] (I)

Kumeri village .- If it is decided to try to survey Government areas from Warg Kumeries, Government must be prepared for long and bitter litigation. It is a game in which the Jenmeri will be at a big advantage, with the great influence they ~~wired~~ would in this backward tract. I should ask the Chief Conservator of Forests to say if the forests which might be claimed as Government forests are valuable enough to make the attempt to claim them worth while. Where there is no valuable timber the cost of the survey would not be repaid (nor a fraction of it) by the increased reserve.

with a dense scrub jungle, and it would also involve Government in a lot of very difficult litigation in which Government would be at a disadvantage. (difficulty of proving that the Jenmis had not exercised rights of a proprietor over the land).

Neither in the ordinary areas nor in the Kumāri areas, therefore, could the Survey possibly repay more than a small fraction of the cost.

The political point of view needs only alluding to. The Legislative Council would have to be persuaded, and the case for Resurvey is weak and bad. If carried out, it would create a lot of bad feeling in a District which is one of the few which have never given any trouble up to this time.

Government cannot afford to waste money and to excite hostility in these days simply to find work for the Survey Department.

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL. G 4815/25 – from B.S. recd a

pp 3-5 c.f
pp 7-8 c.f
p. 9 c.f

Enclosures.

Despatch No.

When given to fair copying

Fair-copied by

Fair-copy com

When despatched

Office, B.O.S. Ref No G 3676/25-2 d/ 5-12-25 A

Register No. G 5200 dated d/ 1925 A

From [illegible]

Subject.

Resurvey (S. Kanara) – Mangalore
Re – B.O.S. Ref No. G 3676/25-2
d/ 5-12-25

To

The Dir of Survey
Coll of S. Kanara } with copy of the Commissioner's opinion d/ 8-3-2
pp 15-16
c.
19-1-26

R 16-2-2
Reminder from Govt d/ 17-2-26
Replied on 20-2-26
H/20
1.26
19
Reminder from govt d/
24-3-26. Replied on 3-3-26
weekly

Retain 32 R/SA/1

D 177

_______________ DEPARTMENT. Roc 32 ~~G.O.C.F. 98~~

_______________ Branch.

SURVEY MADRAS 17 FEB 1926

FEB. 1926

REMINDER.

To The Director of Survey

The undersigned ~~has the honour to invite~~ is directed to invite ~~invites~~ attention to the communication noted in the margin and to request that this reminder may be returned ~~at once~~ with information as to—

Bd's Ref. No. 9106 26-1, dated 19-1-26

(1) the stage at which the matter now is,

(2) the date by which a reply may be expected, and

(3) the circumstances ~~which~~ have caused the delay.

2. It is requested that the reply to this reminder may be sent not later than 23-2-26

BOARD OF REVENUE LAND REVENUE & SETTLEMENT 23 FEB. 1926

Office Board of Rev

Station L R Sett

Dated Madras 22 FEB 1926

C. Gopalan

Signature.

For Secretary

Designation.

15-2-26

SUBJECT. 16-2-26

Survey (S. Kanara) - Mangalore

REPLY.

To The Secretary to the Commissioner of Land Settlement & Survey

The reply will be submitted in the first week of March 26.

BOARD OF REVENUE
LAND REVENUE & SETTLEMENT
25 FEB. 1926

__________ DEPARTMENT.

__________ Branch

REMINDER.

To The Collector of
S. Kanara

The undersigned ~~has the honour~~ to invi
is directed to invite
~~invites~~
attention to the communication noted in the margin and to request that this reminder may be returned ~~at once~~ with information as to—

No. G 106, dated 19-1-26
26-1

(1) the stage at which the matter now is,

(2) the date by which a reply may be expected, and

(3) the circumstances which have caused the delay.

2. It is requested that the reply to this reminder may be sent not later than 23-2-1926

Office Board of Rev.
L.R. & Sett.
Madras

V. Gopalan
Signature.

For Secretary
Designation.

SUBJECT. G / 16-2-26

(S. Kanara) – Mangalore Ha.

REPLY

To The Secretary to the Board,
Land Rev. and Settlem
Madras

S. KANARA
18 FEB 1926

Sir,

The paper is pendi
with the Rev. Divl. offi ~~[illegible]~~
~~of~~ Mangalore. An
urgent reminder has
been issued to him toda

The reply will be sub-
mitted ~~by the end of the~~ in the first week of
~~month~~ the next month.

Your obedient Serv

Mangalore
19.2.26

for Collector

R.O.C.No.1540-B 4 - 26.

South Kanara Collector's Office,
Mangalore, Dated 10th March, 1926.

From

G. W. Wells, Esquire, M.A., I.C.S.,
Collector of South Kanara.

To

The Secretary to the Board,
Land Revenue and Settlement,
Madras.

13 MAR 1926

Sir,

Survey - Resurvey - Mangalore Taluk - Defects in the --- existing survey - Concrete instances to be furnished - Board's reference No.G.106/26-1, dated 19-1-26 - Interim report --------- submitted.

I have granted time till 20-3-26 to the Tahsildar of Mangalore to furnish the information called for by me in the ---- above matter. I shall submit my report by the 25th March, 1926.

Your obedient servant,

For Collector.

U.S. 11-3-26.

11.3.26.

To the Assistant Dir of Survey

Survey - Resurvey - Mangalore Tk - Bd's ref no. G 106/26-1 of 19-1-26. - your reply of 23-2-26 to Board's exchange reminder:

Pl say when your report may be expected

Pl. remind

9-3-26

Please issue

16 3 26

Issued

16/3

16 3 26

16 3 26.

For AS (Sett)

D.Dis.No. 1540-26. 18 G 1263

South Kanara Collector's Office,
Mangalore, Dated 26th March, 1926.

MAR 1926

From

G. W. Wells, Esquire, M.A., I.C.S.,
Collector of South Kanara.

To

The Secretary to the Board,
Land Revenue & Settlement,
Madras.

Sir,

Survey - Resurvey - (South Kanara) - Mangalore --- Taluk- defects in the existing survey - Concrete instances - Board's reference No.G.106/26-1, dated 19-1-26 - report subm p.28 of (N)

pp 35-36 of (N)
R.C 1562/20/25

Para 1 (1) of my report D.Dis.3538-25 dated 24-5-25 to the Board. - reproduced in paragraph 5 (1) of Bd's Ref. No. G 3574-24-4 -9.6.25. The defects noticed in the survey of the following villages of the Gurpur Firka of the Mangalore Taluk are -- of the nature dealt with in this para. Please see the list ------ enclosed. p.22 infra

36	Muchur	113.	Badaga Ulipadi.
37	Kompadavu.	114.	Mogar.
102	Addyar	77	Pachanady.
103	Nirmarga	78	Kudupu.
105	Arkula	68	Adyapadi.
112	Tenka Ulipadi	69	Kolambe.

reproduced in paragraph 5(2) + (3) of Bd's Ref. No G 3574-24-4 9.6.25

Paras 1 (2) & (3) of the above report. Fields of very large extents, each containing a large number of ---------- sub-divisions having no independent plottable data exist, and it is difficult to effect further sub-divisions, as there are no ----- data to fix the boundaries of the existing sub-divisions, and as Bhustiti differs considerably from the mapping. A list of a ----- number of such fields with other particulars is enclosed. In the following cases, it was found necessary to resurvey the fields ------ concerned and issue errata to the Settlement Registers before ------

effecting further sub-divisions in already existing Settlement sub-divisions.

19 Athikaribettu.

S.No.85.	corded area.	Revised area.
	17.73	19.81

Difference 2.08 ~~areas~~ acres & Rs.2/- in assessment increase.

S.No.87-1.	14.78	16.65

Excess 1.87 acres in extent Rs.1-13-0 in assessment. The above 2 fields were resurveyed and errata sanctioned in Collector's D.Dis.1719 D. dated 22nd May 1916.

22 Kavathar.

S.No.81-2	4.59	6.78

Increase of 2.19 acres in area and Rs.2-3-0 in assessment. Errata sanctioned in Collector's D.Dis.1719 D. dated 22nd May 1916.

16 Talipadi.	Area.	Subdivisions.	
S.Nos.65 " 66	9.48 4.80	15 24	Resurveyed and errata issued for

change of shape of sub-divisions and difference in area of the several sub-divisions - vide --- Collector's Dis.121 D. dated 15th January 1918.

" 168 " 17	11.44 24.58	24 6	Do. Vide Collector's Dis.No. 1033 D. -- dated 10th Feb.1924.

21 Elathur.

S.No.28	Recorded area.	Area as per Errata.	
	15.21	13.98	Resurveyed and errata
30	6.17	6.60	issued in Collector's

D.Dis.2563-E4 dated 18th May 1921. Extent decreased by 1.23 acres and assessment by 14 annas.

12	22.41	23.68	Increase of 1.27 acres

in extent and 15 annas in assessment as per --- errata issued in Collector's Dis.4910-23-E4 --- dated 18th October 1923.

25 Inna.	Recorded area.	Revised area.	
S.Nos.151 154	2.46 4.80	2.66 2.40	Resurveyed by the Deputy Surveyor at

the instance of the Land Records Tahsildar. Extent decreased by 2.20 acres and assessment by 8 annas. Errata sanctioned in Collector's ----- Dis.No.2670 D. dated 16th September 1917.

Rev.17	66.55	73.07	Extent increased by 6.52 acres

and assessment by 4-14-0 after resurvey. Errata issued as per Collector's Dis.2549 D. dated 19th August 1918.

67 Malavur. Recorded area. ✓ Revised area. ✓

~~S.No.42.~~ 85.54 59.97 Difference is 25.57 acres in area and Rs.19-13-0 in assessment. Errata sanctioned in Collector's Dis.No.7471 D.23 dated 1st May 1924. ✓

~~S.No.8.~~ Area 106.99 acres. ✓ Contains 65 sub-divisions. Area of 33 sub-divisions changed and errata sanctioned in Collector's Dis.4977-23 dated 3rd May 1924.

67 Malavur

S.No.63. 62.21 ✓ Difference of 8.76 acres in area and Rs.8-11-0 in assessment, increase. Resurveyed and errata sanctioned in Collector's Dis.11645-24 D. dated 4th December 1924.

71 Mallur.

S.No.25. [illegible] Area 110.31 acres. ✓ Contains 85 sub-divisions. Resurveyed owing to change of shape and difference in area of the sub-divisions and errata sanctioned in Collector's D.Dis.1662-23 dated 6th April 1923.

99 Amblamogar.

S.No.7. ✓ 68.02 ✓ 62.50 ✓ Difference 5.52 acre Resurveyed and errat sanctioned in Collector's D.Dis.5376-24 dated 23rd May 1924.

123 Kuriyala.	Recorded area.	Revised area.	Difference.
S.No.46 ✓	6.35 ✓	10.98 ✓	4.63 ✓
" 47	3.40 ✓	4.48 ✓	1.08 ✓
" 50 ✓	24.65	20.60 ✓	4.05 ✓

Resurveyed and errata approved, in Collector's Dis.No.6041-25 dated 9th August 1925. ✓

126 Thumbe.			
S.No.57.	43.47 ✓	46.07	2.60 ✓

esurveyed and errata issued as per Collector's .Dis.No.12254-24 dated 23rd December 1924.

60 Marakad			
S.No.25/9.	35.18 ✓	31.94 ✓	3.24
76 Padushedde.			
S.No.14/1. ✓	24.41 ✓	19.55 ✓	4.86 ✓
" 15. ✓	19.41 ✓	27.97 ✓	8.56 ✓
67 Malavar.			
S.No.78. ✓	42.01 ✓	40.61 ✓	1.40 ✓

Village boundary of the 3 villages effected. Resurveyed and errata issued vide Collector's Dis. No.7036-25 D. dated 18th September 1925. ✓

122.Badagabellur.

(1) 7,8 and 9 - Settlement sub-divisions - in S.No.2 measuring 6.09 acres were re-numbered as S.No.88/1,2,3 respectively. During investigation on the ground, it is found that the shape of the sub.divisions materially changes according to the Bhustiti.

(2) Settlement sub-divisions 7,8 and 9 in S.K. No.17 were re-numbered as Nos.94/1 & 2 and 95 respectively. When a darkhast plot had to be measured in the vicinity it was found out that the mapping of the above fields was wrong. While correcting the shape according to Bhustiti it was found that the adjoining fields in Tenkabellur village S.Nos.92,83 & 117 are also ------ effected.

96.Munnur.	Recorded area.	Revised area.	
S.No.39.	20.20	19.10	Difference 1.10 acres.

Errata sanctioned as per Collector's Dis.No. ---- 5556 D. dated 3rd October 1921.
21-E4

M.D'S.26/3.

Your obedient servant,

For Collector.

27.3.26.

112 Yentra Uelipadi	S. Nos. 6. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 37. & 38		S. No. 32	42	39.
113 Badaga Uelipadi	1. 5. 6. 3. 4, 7. 8. 18. 21, 32, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 48, 50		46, 76 - 85	105	101
114 Hogar	9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 16. 23. 24. 27. 28.			1	48.
77. Pachanadi	1. 3. 22. 28. 29. 30. 57. 64. 65. 69.		17. 19. 31, 35, 36. 6.	60	69.
78 Kudupa	1. 2. 3. 7. 8. 40. 41. 42, 43. 45 48, 49. 51, 53. 32.		8. 9. 45. 30, 49	56	56
~~69~~ 68 Adyapady	6. 7. 8, 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 55 to 60			6.8	68
69 Kolambe	1. to 20, 75 to 78, 80 to 93.			96	93.

26th mar 26

For Collector

26/3/26.

List Showing the Survey defects which exist in the Several Villages of Gurpur Firka.

South Kanara Distri

Number nd name f village	Cases in which there is difficulty of relaying the original offsets from the sides of long triangles into which the blocks have been divided at the original Survey	Survey numbers in which measurements have been omitted from the ferro prints.	S. Nos. in which a large numbers of measurements are incorrect	Number of fields at the time of the Settlement.	Number of fields which have no plottable data.
1	2	3	4	5	6
36 Muchur. ✓	S. Nos. 4, 42, 47, 54. & 55.		S. Nos. 4, 42 - 84	57	7
37 ~~omada~~ ompadavu ✓	S. Nos. 12, 34, 48, 50 & 59		Nos. 4. 6. 60. 66, 68, & 48	70	
102 Adyar ✓	S. Nos 1 to 47			47	
103 Virmarga ✓	No 1 to 120		S. Nos. 1. 2. 4. 8. 11, 12, 20, 28 30, 33, 34, 35, 40, 42, 46, 47, 48, 55, 56, 58, 76, 81, 82, 83 84, 85, 94. 95. 97 115 117		

Village.	S.No.	Extent.	No.of Sub Divisions.
16 Talipadi.	77	40.50	30
	63	19.31	40
19 Athikaribettu.	81	45.90	39
21 Elathur.	36	27.85	57
22 Kavathar.	11	84.40	42
67 Malavur.	8	106.99	65
	93	19.18	90
71 Mulur.	33	51.76	42
	25	110.31	85
25 Inna.	106	57.65	45
	117	53.93	22
	155	60.50	42
122 Badaga-Bel	42	110.28	34
	36	66.23	40
123 Kuriala	18	56.41	46
	23	62.10	47
127 Muda.	124	43.08	25
	50	13.84	53
125 Kallige.	2	43.06	44
	11	46.77	42
	13	58.06	39
	39	51.61	35
126 Thumbe.	42	41.39	24
27 Mundkur.	96	41.88	25
	191	43.63	13
40 Muduperar.	102	102.26	229
48 Chellairu.	5	130.62	133
98 Konaje	46	72.66	58
102 Addyar.	42	24.74	23
	43	49.28	35
	45	60.79	32
105 Arkula.	13	60.58	42
	23	108.45	22
109 Mallur.	2	209.66	160
114 Mogaru.	10	52.92	36
	16	44.43	44
115 Muthur.	10	121.60	38
128 Amtadi	16	83.50	37
	26	49.87	37
134 Sangabettu.	18	36.39	33
	67	39.63	33

M.D'S.26/3.

26/3/26.

Settlement DEPARTMENT.

eply, please quote number, date and short title.

Received Registered

S 1253

From (Name) F.P. Vincent Gompertz Esq.,
(Designation) Director of Survey,
Post Box 404, (Station) Triplicane,
Telegraphic Address Survey Madras,

[illegible] MAR 1926

To The Secretary to the Commissioners of
Land Revenue and Settlement,
Chepauk, Madras.

dis No. 32 R [illegible], dated 26-3-1926.

D[illegible]
29 MAR 192

Sir,

Enclosures 3
2 Books
+ 1 tracing

Spare Copies

Resurvey - (South Kanara) - Mangalore Further report on concrete instances - Submitted.

Please see Board's Reference No.G.106/26-1 dated the 19th January 1926.

The general conclusions which were drawn by the Collector of South Kanara and myself were

(1) the measurement and plotting of new subdivisions more often than not necessitated the resurvey of the whole field, and of the fields adjoining it;

(2) missing marks could generally not be replaced correctly firstly because it was difficult to relay the original offsets from the sides of the long triangles, secondly because many measurements had been omitted from the record of measurement, and lastly because most of the fields have not been supplied with independent plottable data. Another reason can be added, viz., because boundaries of fields have altered considerably since the last survey.

I have been requested to supply concrete instances in support of these conclusions.

2. Plans comparing the two surveys have been prepared for a few fields in each of the two villages resurveyed and are submitted herewith as concrete instances in support of the first conclusion. They also support the second. The plans show that in some holdings the boundaries have altered and

that, even where they have not, the block survey plans often do not show the real dimensions of the holdings so that the width and length of such fields differ considerably from that shown in the block survey plan. When the variation is considerable [illegible] new subdivisions would protrude outside the block map field plan or would not fill the space provided in the plan.

To remedy this the field would have to be remeasured and this should necessitate correcting the fields adjoining. To the faulty block map field plans are partly due the two independent records of measurement for the same fields noticed by Mr. Priestley in Udipi. I saw some in Karkal while inspecting with the present Commissioner and Mr. Couchman. Supplemental subdivisions were made by the Settlement Officer after the Survey Party had left the district and the surveyors sent to measure these, were unable to do so without resurveying the fields but wer apparently not made to pursue errors or to cancel the superseded block map field plans. Resurvey for this reason was much more extensive in parts of Malabar during Janmam Registration and a very large number of fields in Palghat taluk were remeasured and fresh plans prepared for this reason. There is thus no lack of concrete instances.

It will be seen from the plans that there are variations in the shapes of fields even when there is little difference in the perimeter measurements. There are few field plans in either of the two villages where these discrepancies do not occur because errors in a relatively small percentage of the many long lines that were measured in each block map would distort the whole skeleton and produce incorrect field plans more especially because all the bends of a field were seldom offsetted from the same long line.

The tracing of a part of village map enclosed show concrete instances of the difficulty in relaying the long G lines. Out of 64 points 45 were not demarcated and lie mostly in the middle of The lines could be relaid by computing and aligning perpendiculars provided the measurements recorded were quite correct but the process is tedious and probably beyond the capacity of most shanbogues while a small error would increase progressively in the alignment. The country was not open even 30 years ago and many of the lines were aligned by sound so that this method of relaying the long lines and using the offsets must be dismissed as not practical.

It was explained in my letter dated 13th May 1925 quoted in para 3 of Board's Reference No.G.3574-24-4 dated the 9th of June 1925 how unreliable are the figures of measurement reproduced in the ferro prints.

The karnam has therefore to resort to the perimeter measurements in the field measurement book and these are insufficient.

4. I have explained in para 2 above, and the plans enclosed make it clearer, why the measurement of new subdivisions must so often demand the resurvey of the field and its surrounding fields, but wish to make it clear also that there are innumerable concrete instances already in the ferro printed field plans of the district of supplemental subdivision - necessitating resurvey. The greatest number is to be found in Palghat of Malabar, surveyed on a similar method, where it was otherwise impossible to plot the subdivisions needed for Janmam Registration.

A revision of the adangals in South Kanara cannot - therefore be done without a resurvey of the fields containing subdivisions and those not dealt with would have to be - resurveyed by the shanbogues when subdivisions are sanctioned.

4. I submit respectfully that it is in the interests of the ryot that any survey of his property should be reasonably correct and provide a record, making transfer of land cheap and easy, and a means of relaying correctly any boundary in dispute.

The existing survey in Mangalore taluk fulfils none of these conditions nor can the survey be maintained. I have sent a copy of this letter to the Collector and to the Special Settlement Officer, Trichinopoly.

H. Vincent-Compant
Director of Survey.
26.3.26

S.S.26-3-26.

To A.S. (Sett.)

Subd with refce to instructions given personally

G.N. not seen by Superintendent

3/4/26.

See the orders of the Commr. in another pr. Let this be seen by the Supdt. & sent to me

Have we got Mr Priestley's report about the survey of Mangalore taluk particularly?

What is the average size of a [illegible] Mangalore taluk?. Have we information. And what is the average no. of subdivisions per annum

5/4/26

The Director of Survey

Will you kindly let me know, officially unofficially the average cost per sq mile of the resurvey in the Kasaragod Taluk of S. Kanara dt and that of ~~[illegible] resurvey~~ of ~~4~~ ~~acre~~ fields in the Dharmavaram ~~taluk and of 30 acre fields in the~~ Hindupur & Madakasira taluks of Anantapur dt

20/8/4/26
AS (Sen)

Post Copy of Telephone Message.

9th April 1926.

3c

BOARD OF REVENUE LAND SETTLEMENT
10 APR 1926

From

The Director of Survey,
Madras.

To

The Assistant Secretary,
Board (Land Revenue and Settlement),
Chepauk, Madras.

Reference: Your telephone message dated 8th April 1926.

The average cost of resurvey of the taluks in question, so far made out, is as follows.

	Rs.
Kasaragod.	653 per square mile
Dharmavaram.	192
Hindupur.	349
and Madakasira.	243

D[illegible]
9 APR 1926

9/4/26.

For Director of Survey.

GSU
9.4.26

S.S.9-4-26.

Survey - Resurvey - S.Kanara -

Mangalore taluk.

-----

pp(18-27) e.f.

G.1243/26 - A with encls.
G.1253/26 - A -do-

Refce.No.G.106/26-2, d/ 12-4-26.

With refce. to Govt. Memo. No.3184 E-25-2, dated 16-12-1925 the Bd. submits for the information of Govt. the reports of the Collr. of S.Kanara and the Dir. of Survey, with their enclosures, supplying concrete instances in support of the general conclusions to which they have arrived regarding the quality of the survey work in the Mangalore taluk,

2. Govt. ~~wanted~~ ask for a report on the quality of the survey work and the possibility of using it as a basis for future work irrespective of the fact that the survey was not on a traverse basis. The Collr's. report ~~will~~ shows that difficulties are experienced in the Rev.administration and the report of the Dir. of Survey which ~~giving~~ gives instances of the defects in the record, shows that such difficulties are bound to arise. ~~Absence~~ Omissions of measurements, errors in measurements, want of correspondence between the ground and the map and errors in areas ~~seem to be not uncommon~~ have been noticed. Some of the differences in area are ~~indeed~~ very striking. e.g. S.No.42 of 67 of

Malavur; and in S.No.8 of the same village the areas of as many as 33 out of 65 subdivisions had to be corrected. Bad records are a great hardship ~~an impediment~~ to efficient maintenance. As observed by Mr. Chadwick in his evidence before the Sur. & L.R. Committee ~~the~~ "faults in Survey and Registration are more acutely felt by the least vocal point of the community i.e., both the smaller ryot and the lower Govt. officer. Bad records waste the time more of the Revenue Inspector and village officer then they do of the Tahr. who does not handle these records to the same extent. They lead to bad and perfunctory inspection and bad initial work is always costly both in time and money"

p.102 of Vol. II

The Dir. of Survey proposes to resurvey the Mangalore taluk on the lines approved in G.O.No.1554. Rev., d/ 6-9-23 for the block map taluks of Hindupur and Madakasira of the Anantapur district. This will cheapen the cost of the survey though the average cost is expected to be higher than in the taluks of the Anantapu District

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Sectt. II-15 (a)—15,000—2

ag
85-26

Received BOARD OF REVENUE 8 - MAY 1926 LAND REVENUE & SETTLEMENT 192   Registered G 1768 A 192

Abstract.

urvey - Re-survey - South Kanara - Mangalore Taluk - Or~~ders passed~~.

Refce No. G 106 26-3 dt 12-5-26.

Issue
ag
12-5-26

Com-d to the D.S & the Collr of S. Kanara

2/ The Commr proposes to inspect the survey in the Mangalore taluk in August next ✓

Desp? Hu 12.5.   ag 12-5-26   ag 12-5-26

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

ag
12-5-26

G.O. No. 727 dated 7th May pp 31-32 1926.

To the D.S with copy of .. Collr of S. Kanara

READ the following papers :— -do-

ENCLOSURES.

No

From the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue and Settlement No.G/106/26-2, dated the 12th April 1926. pp 31-32 ante

ORDER :-

The Government are not prepared to consider further the question of re-surveying the Mangalore taluk or any other taluk of South Kanara district (except the Kasaragod taluk which is already being surveyed) until the Commissioner of Land Revenue, Survey and Settlement is in a position to express an opinion on the subject based on personal knowledge.

(By Order of the Governor in Council)

J. F. Hall,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue and Settlement.

******

Forwarded.

(By Order)

Superintendent.

Record D partment-

So we humb beg your honor
will be kindly pleased Sanction the
  alore Taluk
Re-Survey to ~~this Dist~~ [illegible] er as the
Re-Survey is going on
Taluk.

~~For which act of Ki~~
for we shall as in dut
pray

We beg to rema
Honored Si
Your most obedt. S

B.M.D'Souza.
A Gonsalves

B[illegible] LAND RE[illegible] & SETTLEMENT
1[illegible] OCT. 1926

The Commissioner (1st Member) of the
Land Records and Settlement of Revenue
Board Madras—

Humble petition of the poor Ryots of Manglur Taluk in Kanar District—

Dated [illegible] October 1926.

Honored Sir

We most humbly and respectfully beg to bring our grievences trusting you will be pleased to take into Consideration—

That your honor Came for Inspection to this District to consult whether the Re-Survey is necessary or mending the mistakes of the former Survey by the Land Record Department= ~~judging~~ the points we beg to State as follow

In the Former Survey there are lot of mistake in the Demarcation= also Several plots washed away in the recent Floods in the Mangalore ~~District~~

In case the mending the mistakes be made by the Land-Record Department the rich Ryot have at liberty to pocket the officers by brib So the poor Ryots will be put into loss [illegible]

There are Several mistakes in the former Su in Demarcation, of the plots in Mangalore Ta

In case if the Re-Servey be Sanctione as going on in the Kassaragod Taluk we a willing to bear the Re-Survey expenses

FOR MEMBER

Survey - Resurvey - S. Kanara
Mangalore taluk

[illegible]

READ AGAIN B.P. No. ____________ dated ____________ 192
" " ____________ , " ____________ 192

READ ALSO :—

Register No. ______, From the ____________, No. ______, dated ______ 192
" ______ " " " ____________, " ______, " ______ 192

1.10
9 wks
1420

______, " , ____________, " ______, " ______ 192

Refer
~~RESOLUTION~~. G 106/26-4 No. ______, dated 14-10-1926.

The Board submits the following report with refe to G.O no 727 Rev. d 7-5-1

The Commissioner of Lo Revenue and Settlement ~~ha~~ he ~~re~~ inspected ~~some of~~ the sur in the Mangalore taluk and is now in a position to express an ~~the~~ opinion on the subject based on his personal knowledge ~~[illegible]~~, ~~that~~ the existing survey is so bad and the field ma are so inaccurate that it is in most cases im-possible to make new missing stones. ~~He is satisfied~~ He is ~~[illegible]~~ satisfied that the criticism (Collr & the D.S. a valid and) that a resurvey of the taluk is necessary & it is therefore recommended.

aa (from orders)
13/10/26

14-10-26

BOARD OF REVENUE
17 NOV. 1926
LAND REVENUE & SETTLEMENT

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

54809

Memorandum No. [illegible] E-26-1, dated 15th November 1926.

Survey - Resurvey - South Kanara District - Mangalore taluk - Board's Refce. -.G.106-26-4, dated 14th October 1926.

In para 3 of its Ref. G.106-26-2, dated 12th April 1926, the Board of Revenue has stated that the Director of Survey proposed to resurvey the Mangalore taluk on the lines approved in G.O.No.1354 Revenue, dated 6th September 1923 for the block map taluks of Hindupur and Madakasira of the Anantapur District and that the adoption of such a course would cheapen the cost of the Survey. The Board of Revenue is requested to report how the rules for clubbing of fields, supply of stones, scale of map etc. suitable for the Hindupur and Madakasira taluks of the Anantapur District - can possibly be suitable for the Mangalore taluk of the South Kanara District.

A.D.Crombie,
Under Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue and Settlement.

Forwarded.
(By Order)

reply, please quote
umber, date and short

39 Settlement DEPARTMENT

Received 30 NOV. 1926 *Registered* h 5011

From (Name) F.P. Vincent Gompertz Esq.,
(Designation) Director of Survey,
Post Box 404, (Station) Triplicane,
Telegraphic Address Survey Madras

To The Secretary to the Commissioners of
Land Revenue and Settlement,
Chepauk, Madras

R.O.C. *No.* 731-R/F of '26 *dated* 27th November 1926

Sir,

Enclosures

Spare Copies

Survey - Resurvey - South Kanara District - Mangalore taluk.

Please see Board's Reference No.G.106/26-5 dated the 18th November 1926. p. 38 ante

The special lines on which the Madakasira and Hindupur taluks were to be resurveyed were-Board's Reference No.G 2414/23-1 dated 13th August 1923 pp 10 - 13 c/r

1. The size of new fields formed out of waste blocks dry lands was to be a maximum of 20 acres. For existing fields the usual limit of 5 acres in wet and 10 in dry was to be applied.

2. As stones are readily procurable throughout the district, ryots should be encouraged to provide them as very few will be needed.

3. Only those waste blocks for which there are dharkhast applications should be split up.

Items 1 and 3 can be conveniently applied in the Mangalore taluk and will reduce considerably the cost of the resurvey. Item 2 cannot as stones are not readily procurab in South Kanara.

Survey - Resurvey - S. Kanara
Mangalore Taluk

G. 5011/26 - A

Ref. no. G 106/26-6 of 13-12-

The letter from the Dir of Sr read above is subd to Govt with refce to their Memorandu No 2682 E-26-1 of 15-11-26

2/ The Board agrees with the Director that items 1 and 3 in his letters can be applied in the Mangalore taluk. ~~with~~ ~~a view to~~ which will reduce the cost of the resurvey

aoy
11/12/26

13-12-26

ig
1226

3/
1/1226

4113

BOARD OF REVENUE
7-JAN. 1927
LAND REVENUE & SETTLEMENT

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

MEMORANDUM.

No.2682 E/26-2, dated the 6th January 1927.

Survey - Resurvey - South Kanara District - Mangalore taluk - Board's Reference No.G.106-26-4, dated 14th October 1926. pp36-37

The Government desire to know what the attitude of the ryots towards the proposed resurvey of the taluk is. The Board of Revenue is requested to ascertain their attitude from the Collector and to submit a report to the Government at a very early date.

J. F. Hall,
Secretary to Government.

To
The Board of Revenue Land Revenue and Settlement.

Forwarded to the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue and Settlement.

(By Order)

Superintendent.

Survey - Resurvey - S. Kanara
Mangalore Taluk

Page 41 — G. No. 113/27 - A

Refce No G. 106/26-7 & 8-1-27

The Govt. memorandum read above is forwarded to the Collector of ~~Malabar~~ S. Kanara who is requested to report through Tahsildar what the attitude of the ryots towards the proposed resurvey of the taluk is.

8/1/27

8.1.27

To the Collr of ~~Malabar~~ S. Kanara.

43 4749

D.Dis.No.516-27.

South Kanara Collector's Office,
Camp, Kaup, Dated 16th February, 1927

BOARD OF REVENUE
21 FEB 1927
LAND REVENUE & SETTLEMENT

From

G. W. Wells, Esquire, M.A., I.C.S.,
Collector of South Kanara.

To

The Secretary to the Board,
Land Revenue & Settlement,
Madras.

Sir,

Survey - Resurvey - (South Kanara) -Mangalore Taluk - Board's Reference No.G-106/26-7 dated 3-1-27 - report submitted.

p.42 c.f

The general attitude of the ryots of the ------ Mangalore Taluk is against a resurvey. Some of the ryots --- state that the existing survey with the corrections made by the Revenue Department is sufficient for their purposes. The are not willing to pay for a resurvey and express doubt as to whether it will be accurate.

Your obedient servant,

For Collector.

17/2/27

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL.

Enclosures.

Despatch No.

When given to fair copying

Fair-copied by

Fair-copy compared by

When despatched

Issue

Office.

Register No dated

From

G 749/27-A

Subject.

Survey—Resurvey. S. Kanara
Mangalore Tk.

To

T

Secy to Govt R D

Reference no G 106/26-8-25.

Subd to Govt with refce to their memorandum no 2682 E/26-2 d 6-1-27

Reg
24-2-27

25/2/27

To The Secy to Govt R D

25.2

GOV OF MADRAS

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
21 MAR 1927

Memorandum No.2682-E/26-3, dated 18th March 1927.

Survey - Resurvey - (South Kanara) - Mangalore Taluk - Board's Referen
G.No.106-26-8, dated 25th February 1927.

The Board of Revenue is requested to supply at an early date information on the following points:-

(1) the total estimated cost of the resurvey of the Mangalor Taluk;

(2) the total area in the taluk which is to be resurveyed;

(3) the portion of the cost which will be collected from the ryots; and

(4) the approximate extent of waste and hill tops in the tal included in the area under item (2).

J.F.Hall,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue and Settlement.

Forwarded.
(By Order)

A Ramanatha Ayyar 19.3

Superintendent.

C.F. 16--12,36,979—24-9-26.

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL

Enclosures.

Despatch No. A8 (SM)

When given to fair copying

Fair-copied by

Fair -copy compared by

When despatched

[illegible]
23/3/27

1·50 [illegible]
23/3

Office.

Register No. G 1173/27—A, dated

From

Subject.

Survey—Resurvey—S-Kan
Mangalore taluk

To

THE

Dir of Survey

Reference G 106/26-9 D) 23-

Forwarded to the [illegible] Di
of Survey who is requeste
to furnish the informati
called for by Govt urgent

[illegible]
22-3-27

[illegible]
23/3/27

[illegible]
22-3-27

[illegible]
28/3

Dd the D.S.

BOARD OF REVENUE
29 MAR 1927
LAND REVENUE & SETTLEMENT

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue Department. G 1306

Memorandum No.2682 E/26-4, dated 26th March 1927.

Survey - Resurvey - South Kanara Mangalore taluk - Memorandum No.2682 E/26-3, dated 18th March 1927. p.45 c.f

In addition to the information on the points mentioned in the Memorandum quoted above, the Board of Revenue is requested to give ~~on~~ an estimate of the proportionate share of the cost of the Central Survey Office which should be debited to the -- ~~X~~ resurvey of the Mangalore taluk.

J.F.Hall,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue and Settlement.

Forwarded
(By Order) ARR. ane the Aggr 28.3.27

Superintendent.

G 1306/27 – A

Letter No. G 106/26-10 d/ 30-3-27

2.50

30/3.

Forwarded to the DS in continuation of R.D's Ref. No. G 106/26-9 d/ 23-3-27. The Director [illegible] need also furnish the addl information called for.

29-3-27

30/3/27

Issue letter

30.3.27

30/3

Settlement DEPARTMENT 49

In reply, please quote number, date and short title.

Received Registered

BOARD OF REVENUE
LAND REVENUE & SETTLEMENT
2 - APR 1927
5

From (Name) F. P. Vincent Gompertz Esq.,
(Designation) Director of Survey,
Posr Box 404, (STATION) Triplicane.
Telegrapnic Address Survey - Madras.

To The Secretary to the Commissioners of,
Land Revenue and Settlement,
Chepauk, Madras.

R. O. C. *No.*203-R/F/27 *dated* 2nd April 1927
Sir,

Survey - Resurvey - South Kanara - Mangalore Taluk.

Please see Board's Reference No.G.106/26-9 dated the 23rd of March 1927. p-46 e.f.

(1) The total estimated cost of the resurvey of the Mangalore taluk is Rs. 3,50,000/-

(2) The area for survey is 333 miles.

(3) The estimated portion of cost to be collected from ryots is Rs. 1,20.000/-

(4) The approximate extent of waste and hill tops included in item 2 is 100 miles.

2. I think the cost of survey to Government would be reduced by at least Rs.100/- a square mile if new fields formed out of waste blocks are to be a maximum size of 20 acres and only those waste blocks split up for which dharkhast applications are received and if the survey of Kumakis is not made.

Ret to 138R/27

50

BOARD OF REVENUE
LAND REVENUE & SETTLEMENT
9 - APR 1927

DEPARTMENT.

Branch.

REMINDER.

To The Director of Survey

The undersigned ~~has the honour to invite~~ is directed to invite ~~invites~~ attention to the communication noted in the margin and to request that this reminder may be returned at once with information as to—

Bds' Refce No. G 472/27-1, dated 21-2-'27

(1) the stage at which the matter now is,

(2) the date by which a reply may be expected, and

(3) the circumstances which have caused the delay.

2. It is requested that the reply to this reminder ~~may~~ be sent not later than

Office Board of Rev
Station Land Rev & Sett
Madras
Dated 6-4-27

K Croaclan
Signature.
For Secre
Designation.

SUBJECT

Survey Parties – Progress report for the quarter ending 31-12-26.

REPLY.

To The Secretary to the Commissioner of Land Rev and Settlement

Retransmitted

Reply is under ~~fair~~ copying and may be expected in the Board's office on Monday the 11

For Director of Survey
8-4-27

Through C.R.

Phone No.2981

C.F. 32(a)

In reply, please quote number, date and short title.*

51

Settlements DEPARTMENT.

BOARD OF REVENUE
9-APR 1927
LAND REVENUE & SETTLEMENT

Received Registered 4/1483

From (Name) F. P. Vincent Gompertz Esq.,
(Designation) Director of Survey,
Post Box 404, (Station) Triplicane.
Telegraphic Address Survey Madras.

To The Secretary to the Commissioners of,
Land Revenue and Settlement,
Chepauk, Madras.

R.O.C. No 203/R/F/27 dated 7th April 1927.

Sir,

Survey - Resurvey - (South Kanara District) - Mangalore taluk.

Enclosures

Spare Copies

Please see Board's Reference No.G.106/26-10 dated 30th March 1927.

The proportionate share of the cost of the Central

Survey Office to be debited to Mangalore taluk is abou

Rs. 23,000.

8.4.27

For Director of Survey.

8.4.27

M.S.B. 8--4--27

8 APR 1927

Survey — Resurvey
Canara — Mangalore Taluk.

[illegible] — G 1173/27
[illegible] — B.S. Refce 23-3-27
~~[illegible] — G 1306/27~~
~~[illegible] — B.S. Refce 30-3-2~~
[illegible] — G 1415/27 = A to Govt ~~[illegible]~~

Issue today
Sd/ 20-4-27

11.45
20/4

Refce No. G 106/26-11 d 20-4-2.

The letter from the D.S. read above to subd to Govt. in refce to their memora no 2682-E 26-~~3~~-3-2

2/ The Dir of survey requested to expedite the submission of the estimate called for regarding the proportionate cost of the Central survey office which should be debited to the resurvey of the Mangalore taluk

Reg 7-4-27

aar 7/4/27

12-4-27

Sd/ 7/4/27

With reference to Govt memorandum No 2682-E/26-4 ated 26-3-27, the Board bmits that the proportionate re of the cost of the Central vey office to be debited to zalore taluk is about Rs 23,000

aar 20/4/27

11-5-1927 C.R.

Fair
20/4

Reminder 54

Commr. of L. R + Sett

issue 2/8/27 11 Hours Wks 38

Refce G-106/26-12 dated 2-8-27

The Board requests the early orders of Govt. on its Refce noted below

[illegible]

cos 2-8-27 2-8-27.

O/c 2/8/27 A/S

Board's Refce O-106/26-4 dated 14-10-

Survey - Resurvey - S. Kanara - Mangalore taluk

To the Under Secy. to Govt. R-D.

Rev 2306·E

Recd 5.8.27

55

5.8.27

AUG 1927

NUE DEPARTMENT

BOARD OF REVENUE,
Land Revenue and Settlement,
Madras, dated 2nd August '27.

N. Macmichael Esq., C.S.I., I.C.S., Commissioner of Land Rev. & Sett

REFERENCE No. G.106/26-12.

The Board requests the early orders of Government on its Reference noted below.

4/8/27

Assistant Secretary

To the Under Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Reference.--

Board's Reference No.G.106/26-4, dated 14-10-1926.

Subject.--

Survey - Resurvey - South Kanara - Mangalore taluk.

3-8.

Endt No 2306E/27-1 of 9-8-27

Sp (6)
9/8/27

The Question is still under the Consideration of the Government

BOARD OF REVENUE
13 AUG 1927
LAND REVENUE & SETTLEMENT

MMWarren
9.8.27
Under Secy to Govt
Rev Dept

To. The Board of Rev (LR&S)
6/8

A.S (Sett)

To A.S (Sett)

15.8.27

Cirs
15-8-27

File
15/8

REVENUE **DEPARTMENT.**

Received 5 SEP 1927 192 *Registered* 24066 192

Subject

Survey - Resurvey and Resettlement - Mangalore Taluk - Bajape and the neighbouring villages - protest petition to Government.

ENCLOSURES.

No

Spare copies

L.DisNo. 7006-27.

Station Mangalore, *Dated the* 2nd September 1927.

From (Name) E. M. Gawne, Esquire, I.C.S.,

(Designation) Collector of South Kanara,

Mangalore

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Revenue Department.

Through the Secretary to the Board,

Land Revenue & Settlement,

Madras.

Sir,

I submit herewith a protest petition received from the ryots of Bajape and the neighbouring villages of Mangalo Taluk of this district. The attitude of the ryots of this Taluk against a resurvey has already been reported to the Board in this office D.Dis.No.516-27, dated 16th February 1927.

Your obedient servant,

Gawne

Collector.

R. F. XXII-A-19.—25,004—5-2-27. (6)

Subject.—

FOR MEMBER.

Survey – Resurvey and Re
S. Kanara Dt. – Mangalore Taluk – certain ryots – protest petition – – submitted to Govt.

READ AGAIN B. P. No. ______ dated ______ 192

" " ______, " ______ 192

READ ALSO :—

Register No. G-4066, From the Collr of S. Kanara No. 7006-27, dated 2-9-1927

" " ______ " " " ______, " ______, " ______ 192

" " ______ " " " ______, " ______, " ______ 192

Refce No. G-106/26-13, dated 16-9-192

A petition received from the ryots of certain villag of Mangalore taluk protes against a resurvey and resettlement of the tract is submitted to Govt.

2/ The collector's report regarding the attitude of the ryots as regards resurvey ~~in the matter~~, was already submitted to Go. Board's Refce G-106/20 dated 25-2-27.

BOARD OF REV. 28 SEP 1928 LAND REV. & SETTLEMT.

94310

ceived. ......1928. Registered............1928.

Abstract.

SURVEY - Resurvey - (South Kanara District) - Mangalore, Udipi and Coondapur taluks - Unnecessary.

Revenue Department.
G.O. No. Mis. 2237, dated 26th September 1928.

----0----

Read the following:-

G.O.No. 727 Mis., dated 7th May 1926.
G.O.No.1853 Mis., dated 11th August 1928.
From the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue and Settlement) No.G.106/26-4, dated 14th October 1926.
From Do. Do. No.G.106/26-13, dated 16th September 1927.
From Do. Do. No.G.2547/27-2, dated 30th November 1927.

ORDER.

The Government consider that a complete resurvey of the Mangalore, Udipi and Coondapur taluks, South Kanara District is not necessary.

2. The Board of Revenue is requested to report in due ourse what survey staff will be needed to deal with such sur ork as may be necessary to bring the records in these Taluks p-to-date in the course of resettlement.

(By Order of the Governor in Council)

D.N. Strathie,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

o the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue and Settlement).

----0----

FORWARDED
(By Order)

Superintendent.

Subject.— Survey – Resurvey – (South Kanara Dt.) – Mangalore, Udipi and Coondapur taluks – Considered unnecessary – G.O. – Communicated

. F. XXII-A-19.—22,004 1-2-28. (6)

MEMBER.

READ AGAIN B. P. No. ______ dated ______ 192

„ „ „ ______ , „ ______ 192

READ ALSO :—

egister No. G-4310, From the Govt., R.D. Mis No. 2237, dated 26-9-1928 A

„ „ „ ______ , „ ______ , ______ 192 .

„ „ ______ „ „ „ ______ , „ ______ , „ ______ 192 .

RESOLUTION. (Mis) No. 3289, dated 4 · X 1928

Communicated to the Director of Survey, the S.S.O No. IV Party and the Collector of South Kanara.

2/ With reference to para 2 of the G.O. the Director of Survey is requested to report in consultation with the S.S.O the nature of the survey work to be done to bring the records up-to-date and the staff that will be needed to do it. The report should be submitted through the Collector

To the Director of Survey

„ „ S.S.O No. IV Party

„ „ Collr. of South Kanara.

1-10-28

2/10/28

/10/28

M,

As(Sett)

OFFICE NOTE.

Subject.

Survey - Resurvey - (S. Kanara) - Mangalore Tk

From

The Dir. of Survey & Collr. of S. Kan

Register No. G 4815/25

To A.S.(Sett)

In their order No 123

Rev dt 11-8-24, Govt at first sanctd the resurvey of Mangalore Tk on the B report on the experimen survey of two villages. In their memorandum dt 2 Govt directed that no wor the purpose of resurvey of taluk should be done & de to be furnished with fresh details of the experiment survey already carried out was done in Board's Ref 3574/24-4 dt 9-6-25. No ord

paras 3-4 at pp 19-20 of BP 1562 / 20.9.25 (N)

pp 33-36 of (N)

were passed by Govt on the subject. Meanwhile as a result of the conference for reduction of work in connection with re-survey and resettlement Govt decided that the question of the resurvey of Mangalore and other taluks of S. Kanara (excepting Kasaragod) among certain other tracts should be examined. In their memo at c ~~fr~~ Govt have further requested the Board to report specifically on the uality of the existing survey the Mangalore Taluk and the possibility of using s a basis for future work spective of the fact that survey is not on a traverse asis.

place item (4) under A. Resurveys at p. ...

The Dir of Survey has bd the further report called r by Govt. In his endorse- t thereon the Collr of S. Kanara tes that he has already pressed his views in his letter -4-5-25 regarding the sity of the survey work the Mangalore Tk and the

pp 3-4 c f

p. 5 c-f

pp 28-29 of Ⓝ

difficulties experienced in the Revenue administration. They have already been embodied in the Bd's Refce to Govt at pp 35-36 of BO 1562 Mis dt 20-7-25. (N)

The Director's report and the Collr's remarks thereon may be subd to Govt.

Draft sub

KSO
1-12-?

30-11-2?

1/12/25

NM
12-25

pp 7-8 c.f.
p. 9 c.f.

[Bd's Ref No. G 3676/25-2 dt 5-12-25
G 5200/25 - From the Govt R.D.
To A.S.(Sett)

Pl see Govt memo at p. 9 c.f. and copy of Mr. Couchman's opinion ⊗ dt 3-3-24 since obtained from the secretariat at pp. 15-16 c.f.

⊗ In regard to Kasaragod tk & the Kumari villages.

May the Dir. of Survey and the Collr of S. Kanara be first requested to furnish concrete instances in support of the conclusions arrived at by them about the existing survey of the Mangalore taluk.

Yes. See also next para

† embodied in Bd's Ref at pp 33-36 of BO 1562 (N) 20-7-25

M1's opinion regarding the

11-1-26

11-1-26.

necessity for a resurvey is found at page 32 of B P No 1608 d 10-7-24, but it was based on the D.S's report and on the existing literature on the subject.

KEO
12-1.26

A copy of Mr Coulleman's note should also be sent to the D.S. & the Collr for their information as that is the case they have to meet.

have no personal knowledge of the survey of Mangalore taluk except for a trifling amount of inspection at Bantval in 7-23.

15-1-26.

To A.S. (Sett.)

Draft subd

19.1.26

8 1 26

181

[Bd's Ref G106/26-1 d 19-1-26.
G 1243/26 - From the Collr of S. Kanara.
G 1153/26 From the D.S.]

To A.S.(Sett)

With refce to the Govt memo at p. 9 c.f the Collr of S. Kanara & the Dir of Survey have furnished concrete instances in support of the conclusions arrived at by them regarding the defective nature of the existing survey of the Mangalore Taluk

2/ The defects noticed by the Collr are set forth in para 1 of his letter at pp 28-29 of Ⓝ and reproduce in para 1 of the Bd's Refce Govt at pp. 35-36 of Ⓝ The Collr has furnished concrete instances of the defe. at pp 19-23 c.f

3/ The DS has furnished comparative sketches ~~of~~ accg to the existing survey & the now resurvey of a few fields in each of two villages experimentally surveyed & also a tracing of a part of the village map of one of the village to prove the defects poin

out in his letter. at pp 23-25
of Ⓝ reproduced in paras 2 & 3
of the Bd's refce to Govt at
pp 33-35 of Ⓝ

It is subd that the letters
of the Collr & the D.S with the
enclosures may be subd to
Govt with the Board's re
marks with refce to the con
cluding portion of the Govt
memorandum - p. 9 c.f

pl see commissioner's rema
— concluding portion at p. 4a

hg
3.4.26

Assistant secy's queries
in the slip attached to the c. p. 28

Have we got Mr. Priestley's
report about the survey of (1)
Mangalore taluk particularly

What is the average size of
a survey field in Mangalore (2)
taluk? Have we information

And what is the average no. of
subdivisions per annum (3)

(1) Mr. Priestley's report
about the survey of Mangalore.
It will be found at pp 22, 26 & 27
of GO 2784 d 17-12-23. He

has not reported particularly about this taluk anywhere else

2) The average size of a survey field in the Mangalore Tk is not known. The average for the S. Kanara Dt is 22.8 acres, the largest in the Presy. Next comes, the Nilgiris with 11.4 acres and next to it Malabar ~~Bellary~~ with 9.2 ~~[illegible]~~ acres

(3) The average no of sub-divisions sancd in the taluk is 2500 (average for the past 3 years). The number sancd during 1924-25 is 2509. For the no of subdns sancd in the several Dts during 1924-25 please col 3 of App III at (E) - Rir,

big

8426

It will be seen therefrom that the South Kanara Dt ~~has the~~ 14,741 sub dns were sanctioned during the year 24-25. (the largest number in the presidency)

The Comparative sketches at (C) & (E) show clearly the difference between the recorded boundaries of the Survey fields & Sub dns & those now on ground in the two villages experimentally surveyed - The traces at (R) shows that the ends of many of the G lines are in the middle of fields - Consequently it will be very difficult to relay those if the stones at these ends are missing

The DS says he has sent a copy of his letter to the SSO Trichinopoly - ~~It may b~~ The SSO's remarks may, if necessary, be submitted separately,

Q/8426.

Resurveys are the evil consequences of a neglect or breakdown of maintenance and a breakdown of maintenance is the inevitable consequence of a fundamentally bad record. Theoretically, no denunciation can be too strong in respect of the Block Map system of Survey. It violates two of the four essential criteria that should be applied to any system of Survey viz. Cost, speed, accuracy and feasibility of maintenance. The Board has however been asked to examine the question apart from the intrinsic defects of the Survey and to report with reference to concrete circumstances on the feasibility of the

Survey work in the Mangalore Taluk and the possibility of using it as a basis of future work irrespective of the fact that the Survey has not a traverse basis. Whether difficulties have been experienced in the Rev. administration because of any inaccuracy or incompleteness of the Survey record has also to be considered. That difficulties are experienced is clear from the Collector's report and that such difficulties are bound to arise is clear from the Director's report. Absence of measurements, errors in measurements, want of correspondence between the ground and the map and errors in areas seem to be not uncommon. Some of the differences in area are indeed very striking, e.g. Sy. 42 of 67 Mala vur and in S. No. 8 of the same village the areas of as many as 33 out of 65 subdivisions had to be corrected.

It would have been better if the Colr. had found it possible to ~~posto~~ ascertain ~~ask~~ and report to what extent subdivision work had to be given up or ~~the~~ was shirked owing to the impossibility on the part of the Rev. Subordinates to attend to it with the existing record. But I think this can be presumed even without his mentioning it. As observed by Mr. Chadwick "Faults in survey and registration are most acutely felt by the least vocal point of the community i.e., both the smaller ryot and the lower Govt. officer. Bad records waste the time more of the Rev. Inspector and the village officer than they do of the Tahsildar who does not handle these village records to the same extent. They lead to bad and perfunctory inspection and bad. initial work is always costly both in time and money." - page 102 Vol. II of the Sur. & L. R. Committee report.

In Govt. memorandum No. 3474/B-23-1, D/ 24-10-1923 it has been stated that a resurvey should not be advised unless it has been proved as a result of a preliminary investigation that such a resurvey is essential both in the interest of administration and in that of the ryot. Mr. Priestley had been asked to report on the survey but he could not complete his investigation of the survey of the Mangalore taluk. His reference to this taluk will be found at pp. 22, 26 & 27 of (I.)

p. 48 of (I)

Govt also wish to know if the present Commr is prepared to express an opinion on the necessity for a survey based on his personal knowledge and verification of the records on the ground. It is not known if the Commr. intends to make any inspection.

Perhaps resurvey on the lines adopted for the Block map taluks of Anantapur Dt. might be cheaper. Want of local knowledge prevents me from enlarging on this point.

aas
07/4/26

Owing to the additional work I have had during the last 3 months as Labour Commr it has not been possible for me to do any inspection in Mangalore taluk I have urgent work in Coimbatore next week We want to get the orders of Govt at once, so it is no use hanging up this file in order that I may go & do inspection. I am therefore not prepared to express an opinion based on my personal knowledge.

The real trouble in replying to Govt is that apparently Govt are not decided as to the principles on which a reserve should be ordered. However we can only assume that the principles laid down in (I) still hold. As regards A.S.'s note on p. 10 above marked A. I shall ask D.S. Meanwhile a draft reply to the Govt Mem. may be drafted. If necessary I shall add a para

Wait after consulting D.S.

Mr
9-4-26

D.S. writes that he proposes similar survey to that in Hindupur / Madakasira taluks, but of course the cost will be much greater. Let me see the draft.

Mr
9-4-26

M,
A.S.(Sett)

To A.S.(Sett)

Draft subd for approval.

2/ The D.S. has since replied to the T.M. regarding cost of resurvey — p. 30 c.f.

by
10.4.26

CG
10.4.26

[D.S.'s Ref G106/26-2 d 12-4-26 pp 31-32 c.f
G 1768/26 - From Govt RD] 33 c.f.

To A.S.(Sett)

M,
A.S.(Sett)

The G.O. is subd for orders.

2/ May it be Comd to the D.S. & the Collr.?

by
5.5.26

AG
8.5.26.

This may be done. The ~~Ct~~ D.S. has already been informed that no further work for the purpose of resurvey should be done pending further orders.

aay
8/5/26.

Draft B.O. 9/5 Mr
B.T.O.

I have already arranged a tour in Coimbatore, Salem, Anantapur & Bellary districts for the end of June & most of July. I shall try to get to Mangalore in August & make myself personally acquainted with the survey.

9-5-26

To A S (Sett)

Draft subd on p. 33 - ?

12526 12526 14/5/26

The file is subd with refce to the Commr's orders above

26726 26726 26/7/26

I shall fix dates as soon as I know when Rev. Member is going to discuss Mr Holdsworth's scheme report.

27-7-26 ✓

The file is again subd.

16826 16/8/26 16826

I shall go to the West Coast towards the end of Sept.

20-8-26 ✓

Having inspected some of the survey in Mangalore taluk I am now in a position to express the opinion based on my personal knowledge that the existing survey is so bad & the field maps are so inaccurate that it is in most cases impossible to make new subdivisions & replace missing stones. I am satisfied that a resurvey of the taluk is necessary.

Recommend this again to Govt.

11-10-26

To A S

Draft subd.

2/ Pl. see in this connection a petition at pp 34-35 c f from some ryots of the Mangalore taluk requesting to sanction the resurvey of the taluk.

13 10 26

13/10/26

13/10/26

I have not much faith in this petn. I hope it is not the production of some Surveyors. It need not be submitted to Govt. It may be simply filed with the papers.

18/10/26

Probably

14-10-26

38 c.f [G 4809/26 - From the Govt RD

B.D's Refced 18-11-26

p.39 c.f. G 5011/26 - From the D.S]

To A.S (Sett)

Pl see Govt memo at p.38 c.f

The D.S's report at p.39 c.f
may be subd to Govt in reply to
their memo.

Draft subd

11/12/26

mg
11 12 26

11/12/26

p.40 c.f [B.D's Refced 15-12-26

p.41 c.f G 113/27 - From the Govt RD]

A.S (Sett

To A.S

The Govt desire to know
the attitude of the ryots towa
the proposed resurvey of the
Mangalore Taluk.

Draft subd

mg
8 1 27

8/1/27

M,
AS (Sett)

p.42 c.f [B.D's Refced 8-1-27

p.43 c.f G 749/27 - From the Collr S. Kanara

To A.S

Pl see Collr's report at p.43
may the report be subd to Gov

in reply to their memo at p 41 c.f.?

ug
22/2 AQ 21/2/27 The Coll's report may be submitted to Govt. It would be interesting to see by what considerations the final orders of Govt. are uided – the people's wishes or the actual difficulties 'elt by the officers that have to administer the Rev. rules ith the existing records.

aas
22/2/27

Yes, without any remarks.

22-2-27

To A.S. (Sett)

Draft subd

ug
24.2.27 AQ 24.2.27 aas 25/2/27

~~To~~

G-4066/27 from Collr, S. Kanara

M3
AS 15/a1
F Section

The petns dispute also with resettlement questions

To A.S. (Sett)

Please see the remarks of the Collr of S. Kanara at p 57 C.f.

The Collr has forwarded a protest-etition from certain ryots of Mangalore taluk against the resurvey & resettlement of their str. At the instance of Govt (p 41 c.f.) the oll r submitted a report regarding the ttitude of the people in respect of the esurvey of the tract. It was submitted to Govt without any remarks according to Mr (now Hon'ble) MacMichael's orders above

D.O.

[illegible]

Office of the Special Settlement
PARTY NO. IV
Camp, PERINTALMANNA.

Dated 7th December 1927

Dear Mr.Venkatrama avvar.

Survey - Resurvey - South Kanara - Mangalore Taluk

May I suggest that, if the Board thinks fit, Government may be for definite orders one way or the other about the resurvey of Mangalore Taluk? The last papers on the subject that I have ~~or~~ are Mr. Gompertz's further report in reply to Board's reference No.G 106-26-1 Dated 19-1-26. at p17 c.f.

the middle of next year. Once the Kasaragod work is over, unless there is more work in that District, I shall be left with 50 or 60 men on my hands, all of them thoroughly conversant with Kanarese and none of them with the slightest knowledge of Malayalam. I would not be able to find them work, nor would I of course be able to dispense with them, including as they do a large number of permanent men or men with many years of service.

Further, the bulk of the work preparatory to re-settlement in South Kanara cannot be put off indefinitely. I do not get orders on the resurvey of

and the other taluks on -

which I have already reported, so as to enable me to expand the work in that District gradually, it will mean a continuation of my present unavoidably vague budgets, continual surrenders of allotments for the next year or two, and finally a sudden enormously increased demand for establishment; this, I think the Board will agree, is not desirable. Nor could I undertake to find at short notice a sufficient number of senior men acquainted with Kanarese to take charge of responsible posts.

Yours sincerely,

MacEwen

M.R.Ry. A.A.Venkatarama Ayyar/Avergal
Asst.Secretary, Board of Rev.
Land Rev. and Settlement.

To A.S. (Sett.)

Please see the above D.O from Mr MacEwen

2/ The difficulties pointed out in the D.O are obvious. In case the decision of Govt on the question of the resurvey of Mangalore and the other west coast taluks is to be put off indefinitely the S.S.O as well as the Survey parties will no doubt be put to much inconvenience. For orders whether an official reminder may be submitted to Govt in the form of a reminder enclosing a copy of the S.S.O's D.O above. The SSO may be told in reply that Govt have been reminded

A d.o. may be sent to the Rev. Secy. asking for ea
orders. A copy of the S.S.O.'s d.o. may be sent to
10/12/07

Please see Board's Refce on p 44 C.F
The present petition also may be
Submitted to Govt

A draft is also submitted.

aos 13/9/17

co 13.9.17

13-9-17

13.9.17

16/9/17

15/9/17

Draft to SSO letter which ~~for various reasons~~ might be used by 1 Pol. in another connection i.e. replacing Scott. Now the Res. man ch. I understand they are still hankering after. Draft DO. letter to Hall asking for early advice as the work in hand in S. Cameroons is drawing to a close & pointing out that the language difficulty makes it awkward to transfer from [illegible]

BEW
12/12

2/ To be returned to section after

D.O. 569 / 14-12-2

My dear Hall,

Survey - Resurvey - South Kanara - Mangalore taluk

Bd's Refer S. 106/26-4 of 14-10-1926.

At the instance of Mac Ewen I am to request that ~~you to get~~ early orders might be passed about the resurvey of the Mangalore taluk. The work preliminary to resettlement in the Kasaragod taluk will be completed in a few months and unless definite orders are passed one way or other about the resurvey it will be difficult for the S.S.O. to arrange for the proper disposition of the men now working in S. Kanara. Most of them know only Kanarese and cannot be transferred to Malabar. Further, the work preparatory to resettlement in S. Kanara cannot be put off indefinitely and in order to ensure steady and continuous work it is necessary that the question of resurvey should be decided as early as possible.

Yours sincerely,

14/12

13/1/27

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

D.O.No.2682-E/26-5.

Fort St. George,

20th December 1927

655
29.12.27

My dear Holdsworth,

Survey - Resurvey - South Kanara - Mangalore Taluk - Your D.O.No.569, dated 14th December 1927.

I am to state that orders on the Board's proposals will be passed only after the Hon'ble the Revenue Member has toured on the West Coast on the return of the Hon'ble Mr.Moir from leave and that in the meantime the Board should proceed on the assumption that there will be no resurvey.

Yours sincerely,

To

B.G.Holdsworth Esq., I.C.S.,
Secretary to the Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue and Settlement.

To A.S (Sett).

Please see the D.O to Mr Hall on p 22 ante and his reply on p 23 an

Submitted that the draft D.O to Mr Mac Ewen put up below may be approved

D.O.3
5-1-28

My dear Mac Ewen,

Survey – Resurvey – South Kanara – Mangalore taluk
Your D.O dated 7-12-27 to Mr Venkatarama ayyar.

I am to enclose a copy of a D.O received from the Revenue Secretary in reply to my D.O asking them to obtain the early orders of Govt on the subject

Yours sincerely,

4/1/28

S (Sett)

Please see the G.O on p 59 c/f.
A draft communicating the orders is
put up below.

2/10/28

1/10/28

28

2.10.28

2.x.28

3.10